APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,244	05/10/2001	Gordon Good	200704491-1	4076

22879   7590   10/27/2010
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
3404 E. Harmony Road
Mail Stop 35
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528

EXAMINER
CALLAHAN, PAUL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2437	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/27/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
laura.m.clark@hp.com

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is prompted by the Applicant's response filed 8-18-2010.

Claims 1-13, 16, 17, 20-22, 24-31, 33-42 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 8-18-2010 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that the rejections of the claims under 35 USC Sec. 102(e)

as anticipated by Bonn et al., US 6,738,908 (henceforth Bonn) are improper. The

Applicant asserts that Bonn fails to teach the features of:

a.)   Sending a security policy document to a plurality of devices.

However the Examiner respectfully counters that such is taught by Bonn at the

cited location, at also for example, at col. 4 lines 38-51 and fig. 1A where a security

policy document is sent to a plurality of devices.

b.)   A database system which stores a plurality of templates…"

However, the Examiner respectfully counters that such is taught by Bonn at col. 6

lines 20-25 where a computer system is taught comprising a memory with an operating

system and software to implement the invention, and storing a plurality of templates"

c.)   "…at least one of the templates (to) selectably incorporate a policy defined

only by a different template. However, the Examiner finds that his limitation is taught by

Bonn at col. 8 lines 38-54.

The Applicant argues that the rejections of the claims under 35 USC Sec. 103(a) as unpatentable over Bonn and Rothermal US 6,678,827 (henceforth Rothermal) are improper because Rothermal fails to teach the features of:

a.)   Including a listing of users in the document created by template expansion where the users are identified by external information. However, the Rothermal teaches this feature at col. 11 lines 18-30 where information including a list of users (user i.d.s) referenced by external information (Company Name, IP Address, etc.) is included.

b.)   "...at least one of the templates (to) selectably incorporate a policy defined only by a different template. However, the Examiner finds that his limitation is taught by Bonn at col. 8 lines 38-54.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-12, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Bonn et al., US 6,738,908. Bonn teaches:

        As for claim 1, a method for automatically provisioning a plurality of computing

devices in accordance with established policies (abstract, col. 2 lines 16-24), the

method comprising the steps of: creating a plurality of templates reflecting said policies

(col. 4 lines 6-51), expanding at least one template at a central location to create a

document comprising expanded information (col. 4 lines 6-51, col. 6 lines 30-53), and

sending from the central location the expanded document comprising the expanded

information to said plurality of computing devices (col. 6 lines 30-53),

        As for claim 2, Bonn teaches interpreting the expanded information by agents

which are respectively resident on each of said plurality of computing devices (col.9 line

33-35: NSD's implement the new security policies).

        As for claims 4 and 10, Bonn teaches the limitations of claims 3 and 9 from which

claims 4 and 10 depend respectively, and further wherein the plurality of templates

includes a first category of templates that reflect policies applicable to all of the plurality

of computing devices (col. 8 lines 1-34).

        As for claims 5 and 11, Bonn teaches the limitations of claims 4 and 10 from

which claims 5 and 11 depend respectively, and further wherein the plurality of

templates includes a second category of templates that reflect policies applicable to

only a subset of the plurality of computing devices (col. 8 lines 42-54).

       As for claims 6 and 12, Bonn teaches the limitations of claims 4 and 10 from

which claims 6 and 12 depend respectively, and further wherein the plurality of

templates includes another category of templates that reflect policies only applicable to

a particular type of the plurality of computing devices (col.8 lines 42-54).

       As for claim 8, a system for automatically provisioning a plurality of computing

devices in accordance with established policies, the system comprising: a database

system which stores a plurality of templates which reflect said polices (col. 6 lines 20-

25), a plurality of agents which are respectively resident on each of said plurality of

computing devices (col.9 line 33-35: NSD's implement the new security policies), and

which communicate with said database system to obtain information with regard to

provisioning and maintenance of the respective computing devices (col.9 line 33-35:

NSD's implement the new security policies), and a communications gateway through

which communication messages are exchanged between said agents and said

database system (col. 5 lines 55-60: Policy manager), wherein said communications

gateway is configured to: retrieve the individual ones of the plurality of templates (col. 8

lines 38-54), expand the plurality of retrieved templates to create respective documents

containing combined template information and expanded information (col. 8 lines 38-

54), and provided the documents containing the combined template information and

expanded information to said plurality of agents (col. 8 lines 38-54), wherein at least one

of the templates selectably incorporates a policy defined only by a different template

(col. 8 lines 38-54).

As for claims 39 and 41, Bonn teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 8 from

which claims 39 and 41 depend respectively, and further wherein at least one template

includes a reference to information external to the template (col. 4 line 64 through col. 5

line 6), and wherein said communication gateway expands the template by creating a

document that includes information contained in the template and said external

information (col. 8 lines 38-54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 3, 7, 9, 13, 16, 17, 20-22, 24-31, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonn et al., and Rothermel US 6,678,827.

As for claims 3 and 9, Bonn teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 8 from which

claims 3 and 9 depend respectively, but not further wherein the structure of said plurality

of templates includes conditional statements that determine whether a template is to be expanded with predetermined information on the basis of the computing device to which the expanded information is being provided. However Rothermel does teach this feature (col. 10 lines 25-35, fig. 3B, fig. 8). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these steps into the method of Bonn. It would have been desirable to do so since such a template field would allow an administrator to configure a network security policy template more quickly.

As for claims 7 and 13, Bonn teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 8 from which claims 7 and 13 depend respectively, but not further wherein said policies are security polices regarding user access to each of the plurality of computing devices. However Rothermel does teach these steps (col. 11 lines 1-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these steps into the method of Bonn. It would have been desirable to do so since this would increase the range of security rules available to an administrator for configuration and hence increase the utility of the method of Bonn.

As for claims 16 and 20, Bonn teaches the limitations of claim 39 and 41 from which claims 16 and 20 depend respectively, but not further wherein said external information comprises a list of users. However Rothermel does teach this feature (col. 11 lines 18-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to incorporate these steps into the method of Bonn.

It would have been desirable to do so since this would increase the range of security

rules available to an administrator for configuration and hence increase the utility of the

method of Bonn.

As for claims 17 and 21, The combination of Bonn and Rothermel teaches the

limitations of claims 9 and 3 respectively. Bonn fails to teach the additional feature

wherein said communications gateway expands a template to include information

contained in a conditional statement only if the computing device to which said

expanded information is to be provided meets the condition. However, Rothermel does

teach this feature (col. 11 lines 35-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these steps

into the method of Bonn. It would have been desirable to do so since this would allow

an administrator to expand a template automatically in cases where statements apply to

a particular network device and hence increase the efficiency of the system.

As for claim 22, Bonn teaches a method of controlling user access to networked

computing devices (abstract, col. 1 lines 63-67), comprising the steps of: storing a

plurality of templates that identify user-access policies for respective ones of said

devices (col. 4 lines 38-51), at least one of said templates including a reference to

information that is external to the template (col. 4 line 64 through col. 5 line 6); retrieving

a template that pertains to a given one of said devices (col. 9 line 10-20), and sending

said document from said central location to the given one of said devices after

expansion (col. 9 lines 30-33), and configuring at least one of the templates to

selectably incorporate a policy defined only by a different template (col. 8 lines 38-54).

Bonn fails to explicitly tech the steps of expanding the template by creating a document

at a central location comprising a listing of users identified in said template and users

identified by any externally referenced information. However, Rothermel does teach

these features (col. 11 lines 18-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these steps

into the method of Bonn. It would have been desirable to do so since this would

increase the range of security rules available to an administrator for configuration and

hence increase the utility of the method of Bonn.

     As for claim 24, the combination of Bonn and Rothermel teach all of the

limitations of claim 22 upon which claim 24 depends. Bonn fails to teach the additional

feature wherein said external information comprises a list of users. However Rothermel

does teach this feature (col. 11 lines 18-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these

steps into the method of Bonn. It would have been desirable to do so since this would

increase the range of security rules available to an administrator for configuration and

hence increase the utility of the method of Bonn.

As for claim 25, The combination of Bonn and Rothermel teaches all of the features of claim 24 upon which claim 25 depends. Bonn fails to teach the additional features wherein all of the users on said list perform a specified role relative to said computing devices. However Rothermel does teach this feature (col. 11 lines 20-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these steps into the method of Bonn. It would have been desirable to do so since this would increase the range of security rules available to an administrator for configuration and hence increase the utility of the method of Bonn.

As for claim 26, the combination of Bonn and Rothermel teaches the limitations of claim 25 from which claim 26 depends. Bonn fails to teach the additional features wherein at least one of the templates includes a conditional statement, and the step of creating a document comprises including information from said conditional statement in said document only if said given device meets the condition. However, Rothermel does teach these features (col. 10 lines 25-35, fig. 3B, fig. 8). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these steps into the method of Bonn. It would have been desirable to do so since such a template field would allow an administrator to configure a network security policy template more quickly.

As for claims 27 and 33, Bonn teaches the methods of claim 22 and 31 from which claims 27 and 33 are dependent respectively, and further wherein the plurality of

templates includes a first category of templates that reflect policies applicable to all of

the plurality of computing devices (col. 8 lines 1-34) and further wherein the plurality of

templates includes a second category of templates that reflect policies applicable to

only a subset of the plurality of computing devices (col. 8 lines 42-54).

As for claims 28 and 34, Bonn teaches the method of claims 27 and 33 from

which claims 28 and 34 are dependent respectively, and further wherein a template in

the second category inherits policies contained in a template of said first category (col. 8

lines 42-54).

As for claims 29 and 35, Bonn teaches the method of claims 28 and 34 from

which claims 29 and 35 are dependent respectively, and further wherein said

inheritance can be selectively disabled (col. 9 lines 1-20).

As for claims 30 and 36, Bonn teaches the method of claims 28 and 34 from

which claims 30 and 36 are dependent respectively, and further including a third

category of templates that pertain to specific devices and inherit policies from templates

in said second category (col. 9 lines 34-39).

As for claim 31, Bonn teaches a method for controlling user access to networked

computing devices (abstract, col. 1 lines 63-67), comprising the steps of: storing a

plurality of templates that identify user-access policies for respective ones of said

devices (col. 4 lines 38-51), retrieving a template that pertains to a given one of said

devices (col. 8 lines 38-67), creating a document at a central location and sending said

document from said central location to the given one of said devices (col. 9 lines 30-35),

and configuring at least one of the templates to selectably incorporate a policy defined

only by a different template (col. 8 lines 38-54). Rothermel teaches the additional

limitations that Bonn fails to teach, namely: wherein at least one of said templates

includes a conditional statement (col. 10 lines 25-35, fig. 3B, fig. 8), wherein the

document comprises a listing of users identified in said template (col. 11 lines 18-45)

and users identified in any conditional statement if said given device meets the

condition (col. 11 lines 18-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these steps into the

method of Bonn. It would have been desirable to do so since this would increase the

range of security rules available to an administrator for configuration and hence

increase the utility of the method of Bonn.

7.   Claims 37, 38, 40, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bonn and Rothermel, and further in view of Teng et al., US

7,380,008.

        The combination of Bonn and Rothermel fails to teach the feature wherein the

document is an XML document. However, Teng does teach such an XML document

where an XML template is expanded at a central location by a server and where the

document includes references to information external to the template (fig. 39, col. 47

line 28 through col. 49 line 34). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature

into the system of Bonn and Rothermel. It would have been obvious to do so since this

would allow for the use of XML documents compatible with common platforms such as

JAVA and allow greater portability of the system.

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571)

273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/PEC/
AU2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437